महोदय, मैं आपसे यह निवेदन भी करना चाहता हूं कि इस मामले को प्रिविलेज कमेटी में भेजा जाए और इस पर गंभीरतापूर्वक और कड़ाई से विचार किया जाए। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the events, as narrated by Shri Ram Deo Bhandary, point to a situation which is nothing but deplorable, that an hon. Member of this House should be treated in this manner by the Ranchi police. It is an unacceptable type of behaviour and, I am sure, all Members of this House would condemn it in the strongest possible terms. I feel, this is a fit case for being referred to the Privileges Committee, because what has happened to one hon. Member can happen to any other Member of this House. I think, therefore, it is a fit case for being sent to the Privileges Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer this motion to the Privileges Committee.

RE. THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2001

श्री सुरेश पचौरी(मध्य प्रदेश): आदरणीय सभापति महोदय, इससे पहले कि माननीय मंत्री जी लोक प्रतिनिधित्व संशोधन विधेयक 2001 पुरः स्थापन के लिए यहां प्रस्तुत करें, मेरा आपके माध्यम से अनुरोध है कि यह बिल एक ऐसा बिल है जो राज्यसभा सदस्यों के निर्वाचन से संबंधित है, यह उनकी अर्हता और योग्यता से संबंधित है। महोदय, 29 अप्रैल, 2001 को जो सर्वदलीय बैठक हुई थी, उसमें स्वयं निर्वाचन आयोग ने यह मत व्यक्त किया था कि जहां तक साधारणतया "निवासी" की परिभाषा का प्रश्न है, यह उसके लिए करना कठिन है, इसके लिए सभी राजनीतिक दल सांसद के माध्यम से विचार-विमर्श करें और इस पर निर्णय लें।

सभापति महोदय, मेरा आपके माध्यम से अनुरोध है कि जब यह बिल चर्चा के लिये यहां आएगा, तब हम विस्तार से इसके गुण-दोषों के आधार पर अपने विचार व्यक्त करेंगे। महोदय, चूंकि आज ही यह बिल सद्स्यों को सर्कुलेट हुआ है और इसमें चूंकि सारी राजनीतिक पार्टियों के मंतव्यों को जानना है यद्यपि यह बिल राजनीतिक पार्टियों से विचार-विमर्श किए बगैर फ्रेम किया गया है। फिर भी मेरा आपके माध्यम से यह अनुरोध है कि इस बिल पर हम प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त करें उसके लिए आवश्यक है कि हमें इस बिल को पढ़ने के लिए पर्याप्त समय मिले और इस बिल को आगामी कुछ दिनों के लिए इंट्रोड्यूस करने से रोकें ताकि हम इस के ऊपर गुण-दोष के आधार पर जब यह सदन में इंट्रोड्यूस हो और बाद मैं चर्चा के लिए आये तो अपना मंतव्य कर सकें। ऐसा मेरा अनुरोध है।

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal) : Sir, I completely support whatever arguments Mr. Pachouri has given. But, more than that, this Bill actually provides for certain changes which will basically change the character of the Council of States, as pointed out in the constitutional scheme itself. So, we also raise the question of legislative competence of this House to discuss this Bill. Under these circumstances, Sir, you may

kindly ask the Minister to delay the introduction of this Bill, so that proper consultation can take place among the parties.

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY) : Sir, I will just point out one small fact. I have absolutely no difficulty in accepting the suggestion, if, within the parties or among the parties or at some other level, discussions are required. This is not a subject which has come suddenly. It has been discussed in this House. In fact, on this very subject, an all-party meeting has already been held. In that all-party meeting, which Mr. Pachourie referred to, on 29lh April, 2000, most of the major political parties agreed to it. Of course, some also opposed it. I will just read out the first sentence of the minutes. It says, "The Bahujan Samaj Party, the Bhartiya Janata Party, the Communist Party, the Indian National Congress, the All-India Anna DMK, the Forward Block, the Trinamool Congress, the Lok Dal, the DMK, the Samta, the Shiromani Akali Dal, were of the view that in view of the changed ground realities, section 3 of the Representation of the People Act should be amended so that the person from any State could be elected to the Rajya Sabha, like the Lok Sabha." Similarly, on the other aspects contained in this Bill; for example, with regard to open voting, we have also the recommendation of the Ethics Committee of this House itself. This report was presented on 8m December, 1998. It very clearly said that in view of the malpractices which have come into the Rajya Sabha elections, secrecy in the voting is, perhaps, perpetuating them. Therefore, it is time for the House to consider switching over to an open ballot system.' That is the unanimous recommendation of the Ethics Committee.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Sir, he is distorting the facts of the Committee. First of all, the agenda never included this particular subject. Secondly, secret ballot is the *sui generis* part of the parliamentary system. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY : Sir, I am referring to a separate aspect. *...(Interruptions)...* I have absolutely no..*(Interruptions)...*

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य ने यह सही कहा है कि जो मीटिंग आयोजित की गई वह गृह मंत्री जी ने आयोजित की थी, उसमें विधि मंत्री जी पहुंच गये थे और उस मीटिंग के लिए जो ऐजेंडा वितरित किया गया था, आपने यह जो सैक्शन तीन के प्रॉवीजन की बात कही है, रिप्रजन्टेशन ऑफ पीपल एक्ट, 1951 में, ये सारी बातें ऐजेंडा में नहीं थीं। फिर भी इन बातों को चर्चा के दौरान हम लोग उठायेंगे। मेरा आपके माध्यम से अनुरोध यह है कि अभी जो बिल है वह इंट्रोडक्शन की स्टेज में है, उसको आप आगामी कुछ दिनों के लिए रोक दें ताकि इस बिल को पढ़ने के लिए हमें पर्याप्त समय मिल सके।

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, I have absolutely no difficulty. It may be taken up next week. But I may just clarify that this was a meeting which was called by the Election Commission on 29th April, 2000. There was a proper agenda. The very first item related to this. And all major political parties were of the opinion that this change should be brought about. If any further discussion is..*(Interruptions)...*

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI (Kerala) : No. Not at all. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : You are totally distorting the facts. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: I have read out the minutes of the Election Commission meeting. *...(Interruptions)...* Sir, I am reading the minutes. *...(Interruptions)...* I have absolutely no difficulty if it is taken up any day, next week, for introduction.

SPECIAL MENTIONS

Ancient Indian History

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU (Pondicherry): In Tamil Nadu, Thanthai Periyar and Anna fought against the Varna system for a very long time. When Rajaji was the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, he tried to implement the same. With great difficulty, and after a lot of sacrifices, we were able to prevent the same. The Varna system was prevalent in India, but now we have come out of it. There is mention of Varnas in the ancient history also. But, unfortunately, the CBSE has ordered removal of these portions from the XI Standard history books. Sir, the students should know the real facts of history. The portions that have been sought to be removed from the ancient history of India are as follows: "Varnas or Castes were made hereditary by law and by religion. All this was done to ensure that Vaishyas produce and pay taxes; Sudras serve as labourers; Brahmans act as priests; and Kshatriyas as rulers. What was done by the slaves and producing sections of Greek and Rome under the threat of whip, was done by Vaishyas and Sudras, out of conviction formed through Brahmanical indoctrination and the Varna system." My point is, there is no need to remove the same. My grandfather and great-grandfathers were Sudras. I am also a Sudra. But, at present, myself and my sons have come out of the clutches of the Varna system. We are all living together, without